

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-39 are pending. The Examiner's allowance of claims 1-26 and 28-36 (subject to the clarification discussed below regarding claim 31), and his indication that claims 37-39 contain allowable subject matter are gratefully acknowledged.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting the telephone interview with the undersigned on April 13, 2005. In that interview, the Examiner confirmed that the indication of claim 31 being allowed in the Final Office action dated February 18, 2005 was erroneous. Claim 31 was dependent from rejected independent claim 27 and therefore cannot be allowed. However, the Examiner also acknowledged that dependent claim 31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 27 as pending upon entry of Amendment A mailed on November 16, 2004.

Also discussed in the interview was the proposed amendment to independent claim 27 that is discussed in detail below. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment to claim 27 overcomes the rejection based on Harris, et al. (US 5,787,865), and would also define over Beakley, et al. (US 4,971,017). The Examiner indicated that he would need to review the other references of record before allowing amended claim 27.

The Examiner has rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harris, et al. (US 5,787,865). According to the Examiner, "Harris teaches, at Figure 4, a seal which, when inserted into the structure, is deflected somewhat by the center pole which expands once it is forced through its mounting hole. This must be true because we know that in order to open the seal must return to a position wherein a gap is created between the seal and the inlet hole. Thus, the expansion of the center post on insertion does meet applicant's language requiring deflection of the seal 'to ensure engagement' of the first and second seats."

The Applicant has amended independent claim 27 to further recite that the seal has a sealing portion adjacent the fuel passageway, and that the method includes deflecting the

sealing portion of the seal to ensure engagement with the first and second seats. Harris, et al. does not teach or suggest any deflection of a sealing portion of the umbrella valve 94 (i.e., the portions adjacent the passive fill ports 92 that contribute to sealing). Rather, the deflection described by the Examiner for Harris, et al. occurs only at the center pole or rivet-like member that is used to mount the umbrella valve 94 to the containment vessel 90. For these reasons, amended independent claim 27 is allowable.

Dependent claims 31 and 37-39 contain allowable subject matter, as has been acknowledged by the Examiner. However, claims 31 and 37-39 depend from amended claim 27 and are also allowable for the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 27.

For these reasons, entry of this Amendment and allowance of claims 27, 31, and 37-39, in addition to the previous allowance of claims 1-26, 28-30, and 32-36, are respectfully requested.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard L. Kaiser
Reg. No. 46,158

File No. 081276-9138-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
(262) 956-6576

X:\clientb\081276\9138\F0161259.1